(195) Department.

SERIES.

G.O. No. 2261

Dated 27-10-47

Memo No. 60810-A-1, dt. 7-8-1947.

Age limit for appointment as Principals of Colleges.

A suggestion has been made that the Special rules for the Madras Educational Service be amended so as to prescribe that fhr promotion to posts of Principals of Government Colleges the names of only such of the officers as have not exceeded the age of 50 years should be considered. Rule 5(B) of the Special Rules already contains such a provision in the case of appointment by transfer to the Administration section. of the Service. The reason given in support of the suggestion is that one cannot devote himself with sufficient interest to the service of the institution concerned if he is expecting to retire shortly and that for the work of a college to be carried on properly and efficiently the Principal should be one having at least befer 5 years of continuous service yet before him. The Director of Public Instruction is requested to offer his remarks on the suggestion.

ucation Department.

Dr. S.R.U. Savoor, M.A., D.Sc., I.E.S.,
Director of Public Instruction, Madras.

To

The Secretary to Government,
Education and Public Health Department.

Dis No. 5520 /47, dated 1-10-47.

Sir,

Sub: Madras Educational Service- Age limit for appointment as Principals of Colleges- Fixing at 50 years- Not favoured- Remarks submitted to Government.

Ref: Government Memo. No. 60810 A. 1 Edn., dated 7-8-1947-

With reference to the suggestion contained in the Memo. cited above I may submit that it is not correct to say that a person who is to retire shortly will be inefficient or indifferent to the interests of the College. Experience has shown that Professors or Lecturers appointed as Principals after they reached 50 years of age have been quite efficient and devoted to their work. The fact that they were due to retire within a short period has not so far affected the quality of their work if their record as lecturers was satisfactory. I feel that the existence of an age-limit for promotion even in the case of posts in the Administrative section of the Madras Educational Service is not quite justified and the case for introducing such an age quite justified and the case for introduction of such an age restriction in regard to promotion to posts of Principals is therefore, even less justifiable.

2. The suggestion, if implemented will result in senior and experienced officers serving under comparatively junior officers who may be by no means more efficient than those whose promotion is prevented by the proposed age-rule. This position will give room for unnecessary friction in the day to-day administration of the College and will probably undermine discipline in the institution.

3. Moreover, the posts of Principals are all in the selection category " and there is nothing to prevent an inefficient or lethariagic officer over 50 years of age, being superseded by a young and suitable officer, and the object with which the prescription of an age-limit is proposed would beserved equally well if greater care is exercised in promoting lecturers.

4. In the above circumstances I do not support the suggestion contained in the Government Memorandum referred to above.

Sd.
For Director of Public Instruction.

True Copy

Secretary , E. & P.H.

As it stands at present under the rules all Principals of Colleges are promoted according to their seniority. There are cases in which they retire after 6 months or one year after they become principals. The result, in many cases, is that the principals are not able to work sufficiently long in their places to appreciate the administrative difficulties in the Colleges and attend to them properly and with interest. One must have atleast 5 years normally to understand the position. and take interest in the work.

I understand that there is a rule in the administrative section that nobody after 50 years should be promoted as a District Educational Officer, The reason for the rule is that there is no use of promoting a man as District Educational Officer when he is about to retire. A man who is retiring will not take much interest in his work and that rule is very salutary. I think the same rule should be applied also in the case of promotion as principals. If the work in our Colleges is to be done efficiently and with interest, the man posted as principal should look forward to a continuous period about 5 years to do his work well. If he is expecting retirement within a year, he will not take much interest in the work.

So I propose that the rule which is followed in the administrative section may also be applied to the Colleges for promotion of administrative heads such as principals.

T.S.A. 25.7.47.
H.M. Education.

With reference to S on p 1 ante, it may be pointed out that, under the existing rule- rule 2 (b) (ii) of the Special Rules for the Madras Educational Service- the posts of Principals of all Colleges (Government) are "Selection posts" - i.e. appointment. to them should be made on the basis of merit and ability seniority being considered only where merit and ability are approximately equal.

The reason for framing the rule which says that no officer is eligible for "promotion" to the Administration Section of the Madras Educational Service if he has attained the age of 50, was that administrative work for an officer promoted from the Subordinate Educational Service involved a more marked increase of responsibility and a need for a flexibility of mind in dealing with a new environment of people and of situations- which would not be usually found in persons over 50.

The Director of Public Instruction may first be consulted on the suggestion to frame a similar rule in regard to promotion to Principals' posts.

It may however be noted that conditions in the Collegiate line are entirely different from those in the Administrative line . Principals and Professors have no touring work and even a man above 50 can do his work well. In fact, age is considered to carry with it increased knowledge, an essential part of Prof.'s equipment and ripened experience. Some of the Principals and Professors in the past were at their best when they were above 50.

A draft memo to the Director of Public Instruction is submitted

I agree that the availability of the rule in the Administrative section will not hold. Having regard to the venture to the collegiate work, and to the fact that it is only occassionaly that major problems arise which will require a long period of time to push through and would require a miracle hand to see them through, I doubt whether it is really necessary to insist on a person being able to stay, in a place for 5 years. And on the other hand the denial of promotions, to persons otherwise suitable, merely on the ground they passed 50 would, I think, be really a hardship on.them.

Director of Public Instruction veiws may be obtained.

(Issued as Memo. No. 60810 A-1 dated 7-8-1947)
From the Director of Public Instruction No. 5520/47 dated 1-10-47.

Please see the minute of H.M. (Edn.) on pages 1-2 ante. The Director of Public Instruction is not in favour of the proposal for the reasons stated in his letter on page 3 cf. Please see also secretary's note on page 3 ante.

In the circumstances it is for orders whether the proposal need be purused.

May be circulated to H.M. (Edn)

It is presumed that the matter need not be pursued. In this case the papers may be Recorded.

G.O. Ms. No. 2261 Edn.
Dated 27-10-1947.
M.E.S.- Agelimit for appointment as Principals of Colleges- Suggestion to fix the upper limit at 50 years papers recorded.

True Copy

R. Thiagarajan 9.2.54

Office Assistant,
Madras Record Office.